

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 31, 2009. Claims 7 to 18 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 7, 11 and 15 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033554 (Ayyagari) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0111138 (Park). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 7, 11 and 15 are directed to a communication apparatus that determines determining whether the communication apparatus and a controlled device are directly connected to a first transmission medium. According to the claims, the communication apparatus detects the controlled device from among a plurality of devices connected via a network and obtains an IP address for the controlled device. The communication apparatus then transmits a request for inquiring whether the controlled device having the obtained IP address is connected to the first transmission medium, where the communication apparatus is directly connected to the first transmission medium, and the request is transmitted via the first transmission medium. If a response corresponding to the request is received from the controlled device, then the communication apparatus determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are directly connected to the first transmission medium. On the other hand, if no response to the request is received from the controlled device, then the communication apparatus determines that the controlled device and the communication apparatus are not directly

connected to the first transmission medium and that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a second transmission medium different from the first transmission medium. With this latter determination, warning information is displayed on a display unit.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 7, 11 and 15, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of a communication apparatus i) transmitting a request for inquiring whether a controlled device having an obtained IP address is connected to a first transmission medium, and ii) determining whether the communication apparatus and a controlled device are directly connected to a first transmission medium, wherein the determining unit/step (a) determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are directly connected to the first transmission medium, if a response corresponding to the request is received from the controlled device, and (b) determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are not directly connected to the first transmission medium, if no response to the request is received from the controlled device and the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via a second transmission medium different from the first transmission medium, wherein the communication apparatus displays warning information on a display unit if the determining unit determines that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are not directly connected to the first transmission medium and the communication apparatus and the controlled device are connected via the second transmission medium.

Ayyagari is seen to disclose a proxy-bridge device that utilizes a protocol stack such that the proxy-bridge device is just another device in a piconet to other devices in the piconet. The Office Action alleged that Ayyagari uses both BLUETOOTH and UPnP protocols, and that upon a failure to receive a response due to a timeout, it “implies” that both devices are not directly connected using the same protocol. This reasoning is not well founded. In particular, the claims make it clear that a determination that the communication apparatus and the controlled device are not directly connected to the first transmission medium is made based on 1) a failure to receive a response to the request inquiring of the controlled device whether it is connected to the first transmission medium and 2) that the two devices are connected via a second transmission medium different from the first transmission medium. The assertion made in the Office Action is that the two devices are not connected via either BLUETOOTH or UPnP since no response is received via either protocol. Thus, the external device is not connected at all since no response is received. This is clearly different from the determination made by the invention.

The Office Action also admits that Ayyagari fails to teach the display of the warning information as claimed, but cites Park for allegedly teaching this feature. Here, it is noted that the warning information is displayed based on the foregoing two part determination and since neither Ayyagari or Parks teaches the second part of the determination (i.e., that the two devices are connected to the second transmission medium), the proposed combination fails to teach the triggering mechanism for the warning

information as claimed. Accordingly, the claims are believed to be allowable over Ayyagari and Parks.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Claims 7 to 18 are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 4360503v1